

Customized PTO/SB/21 (04-07)

W 1		
BANKY O	Application #	10/566,242
TRANSMITTAL FORM	Confirmation #	3423
	Filing Date	January 30, 2006
(for all correspondence after initial filing)	First Inventor	HUMAN
	Art Unit	1732
	Examiner	McDowell, Suzanne E.
Total number of pages in this submission =	Docket #	P08831US00/DEJ

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)						
Fees calculated below Response to Restriction including Attachment After Final Amendment including Attachment Extension of Time Petiti	c(s) t/Reply c(s)	Certified Informa Drawing	d Copy of Prio tion Disclosure	s/Incomplete A rity Document(e Statement		
FEES CALCULATION: For c	aims if requ	ired and/or other fe	es as shown	below:		
☐ TOTAL CLAIMS ☐ INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	NOW 17 4	Previously Paid For - 20 - 4	Present Extra	Rate X \$ 50 = X \$ 200 =	<u>\$</u>	
TOTAL OF ABOVE CLAIMS FEES =						
Reduction by ½ for small entity status of applicant SUBTOTAL =						
☐ Fee for extension of time (per attached Petition) ☐Other fee for						
			TOTAL C	F ALL FEES =		
☐ Payment by credit card. FORM PTO-2038 in the amount of \$ is attached.						
The Director is authorized to charge any fee, additional fee or extension fee due in connection herewith to Deposit Account No. 12-0555: (1) if no payment or an insufficient payment is enclosed and a fee is due in connection herewith; or (2) if no petition for extension of time is enclosed but an EOT is required - and in this event, applicant hereby petitions under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for an extension of time of as many months as are required to render this submission timely.						
Date: July 9, 2007		Document By: Dolle	(an E fen glas E. Jackso	hom		

STITES & HARBISON PLLC • 1199 North Fairfax St. • Suite 900 • Alexandria, VA 22314 Tel: 703-739-4900 • Fax: 703-739-9577 • Customer No. 00881

Registration No.: 28,518



RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

Application #	10/566,242
Confirmation #	3423
Filing Date	January 30, 2006
First Inventor	HUMAN
Art Unit	1732
Examiner	McDowell, Suzanne E.
Docket #	P08831US00/DEJ

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. VA 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the second restriction requirement contained in the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, Applicant hereby traverses the restriction requirement.

In the Action, the examiner has quoted MPEP §806.05(j) in support of the restriction requirement. However, as this is a <u>national stage application</u> (filed under 35 USC § 371), the PCT standard under PCT Rule 13.1 (as cited in the previous restriction requirement) is the proper standard - see MPEP § 801, § 802, § 1850, § 1893.03(d) and § 1896.

As noted in the previous restriction requirement, this standard is whether the inventions are "so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention")". In the international stage of this national application, <u>and</u> in the previous restriction requirement, unity of invention of claims 1-14 was found (and see in the previous restriction requirement the special technical features common to claims 1-14 as recited therein on page 2, the next to last "bullet").

Therefore, claims 1-14 of this national stage application have unity of invention and this national stage application is entitled to have both sets of method claims examined. For these reasons, withdrawal of this restriction requirement and

examination of all claims 1-14 is thus solicited.

As the reply to a restriction requirement must also contain a responsive election even when the restriction requirement is traversed, applicant hereby elects method claims 1-10 with the traverse as noted above.

Further and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

By: Douglas E. Jackson Registration No.: 28,518

STITES & HARBISON PLLC + 1199 North Fairfax St. **+** Suite 900 **+** Alexandria, VA 22314 Tel: 703-739-4900 **+** Fax: 703-739-9577 **+** CUSTOMER NO. 00881